

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed September 2, 2005, claims 2-9 and 11-20 are allowed; claims 1 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakano et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,012,862)(previously cited) in view of Rasmussen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,324,020)(newly cited). The foregoing rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 10 are amended for clarification. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 10 can be found at FIG. 4. Claims 1-20 are pending and under consideration.

At page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner admits that the arm member 15 disclosed in Nakano et al. is not "rotatably mounted" for rotational movement. However, the Examiner asserts that Rasmussen et al. discloses this feature.

The Applicants respectfully submit that neither Nakano et. al. nor Rasmussen et al., individually or combined, disclose "a paper stand rotatably installed under the ejecting roller to rotate in a direction relative to the ejecting roller such that the paper stand rotates to an upper limit thereof and supports the paper when the ejecting roller is rotated in an ejecting direction, and rotates to a lower limit thereof and drops the paper into an output tray when the ejecting roller is rotated in a reverse direction to the ejecting direction," as recited in amended claims 1 and 10.

That is, Rasmussen et al. fails to make up for the deficiency of Nakano et al. as mentioned above. Instead, Rasmussen et al. discloses a paper stacking system for printers. Specifically, The paper stacking system includes a pair of elongated wings 32 and 34 pivotally secured to the floor of the tray such that each wing extends along an opposite one of the tray's side walls (see column 2, lines 44-46). The wings 32 and 34 each include a sheet-supporting surface 32a, 34a capable of selectively, collectively supporting an expelled sheet (see FIG. 2). In Rasmussen et al., the wings 32 and 34 rotate about the pins 36a and 38a which are directly pivotally secured to the floor. The pivot of each wing is limited in one direction by the tray's side walls and in the other direction by a stop adjacent one of the legs.

Therefore, the combination of Nakano et al. and Rasmussen et al. fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness over the present invention.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejections is respectfully requested.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 11/30/05

By: Deidre M. Davis
Deidre M. Davis
Registration No. 52,797

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501